

REMARKS

Claims 2-4 and 8-25 are all the claims pending in the application. By this amendment, new dependent claims 18-25 have been added, and claim 10 has been rewritten in independent form. Thus, claims 3, 4, 10, 12, 14, 16, and 17 are independent claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 14-16 are allowed.

Claim 10 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. In response, Applicant has rewritten claim 10 in independent form.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Examiner has indicated that claim 11 is indefinite because it depends from a canceled claim.

In response, Applicant has rewritten claim 11 so that it depends from pending independent claim 12.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Maruko et al. (6,217,463).

With respect to independent claims 3 and 4, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection at least because Maruko does not disclose the claimed golf ball including linearly or curvilinear extending ridge-like lands *on a spherical surface of the golf ball*.

FIG. 1 of Maruko discloses a golf ball that includes a core 2, an inner cover 4, and an outer cover 6. Ribs 8 at the bottom side of Maruko's outer cover 6 extend downward toward the inner cover 4.

Therefore, the ribs 8 shown in FIG. 2 of Maruko, which the Examiner asserts as corresponding to the recited ridge-like lands, cannot reasonably correspond to lands provided on the spherical surface of the golf ball. Moreover, the *large portions* extending upward from the Maruko's inner cover 4, which are formed in the cutway portions 10 of the outer cover 6, are not linearly or curvilinear extending ridge-like lands.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of independent claims 3 and 4.

Claim Rejections Under 35 103

Claims 2, 9, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maruko et al. (6,217,463). Claims 8, 12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogg (2002/0032083).

Independent Claim 12

With respect to independent claim 12, Applicant has amended the claim to recite that each of the plurality of lands is not connected to any other land on the spherical surface of the golf ball.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Maruko nor Ogg teaches or suggests the claimed golf ball, which includes a plurality of linearly or curvilinearly extending ridge-like lands on a spherical surface of the golf ball, wherein each of the plurality of lands is not connected to any other land on the spherical surface of the golf ball.

For example, as discussed above with respect to claims 3 and 4, Maruko's ribs 8 are not lands provided *on the spherical surface of the golf ball*. Moreover, Ogg merely discloses a golf ball in which the lattice members provided on the surface of the golf ball are *always connected to* one another.¹

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claim 12.

Independent Claim 17

With respect to independent claim 17, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection at least because Ogg does not disclose the claimed golf ball, which includes a plurality of linearly or curvilinearly extending ridge-like lands on a spherical surface of the golf ball, wherein each of the plurality of lands is not connected to any other land on the spherical surface of the golf ball.

As discussed above, Ogg merely discloses a golf ball in which the lattice members that form polygons are *always connected to* one another.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 17.

Dependent Claims 2, 8, 9, 11, 13, and 21

With respect to dependent Claims 2, 8, 9, 11, 13, and 21, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of these claims at least because of their dependency from claim 12.

¹ See Ogg at FIGS. 1-4.

New Claims

Finally, Applicant has added new dependent claims 18-25 in order to provide additional subject matter. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are patentable at least because of their dependency from one of claims 3, 4, 10, 12, 14, 16, and 17.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/John M. Bird/

John M. Bird
Registration No. 46,027

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 16, 2007

Attorney Docket No.: Q76636